Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/692,949		SWEDOR ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Sean Reilly		2153	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) Sean Reilly (Examiner).	(3)			
(2) <u>David Dagg (Applicant's Rep)</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>13 September 2005</u> .				
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)∐ No.			
Claim(s) discussed:				
Identification of prior art discussed:				
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.)⊠ was not reac	hed. h)⊟ N/	'A.	4
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Discussion of the Humpleman reference and the state of the prior art in general with respect to network device management. No agreement was reached however, the Examiner agreed to review Applicant's submitted arguments.</u>				
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)				
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.				
		•		
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	 Exa	aminer's signa	ature, if required	